Application No. Applicant(s) 09/604,113 SZEWERENKO ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner **Art Unit** Tuan A Vu 2124 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Tuan A Vu. (2) James Brady. (4) Date of Interview: 2/05/2004. Type: a) ✓ Telephonic b) ✓ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: N/A. Claim(s) discussed: 1-9. Identification of prior art discussed: N/A. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) \times N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner notified some informalities in some claims that would not enable the status of all claims to be in better condition for a potential allowance; but Attorney had no immediate authority to resolve what was suggested by Examiner; hence it was agreed that an office action be sent out. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Luantholy

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required